

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF ILLINOIS

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

Plaintiff,

v.

EDWARD L. STIEF, JR.,

Defendant.

Case No. 24-cv-40043-JPG

MEMORANDUM AND ORDER

This case is before the Court on Defendant Edward Stief's Motion to Reconsider Order of Detention (Doc. 81). Defendant cites two reasons the Court should reconsider his detention. First, the victim passed away, which alters his potential risk to the community. Second, his counsel needs his assistance to search for and locate documents. Defendant asserts that, in determining the amount of restitution he owes, he should be given credit for any expenses he paid on behalf of the victim. He alleges he has documents to support his claims of payments for the victim, and his counsel needs his help to locate them.

The Court held an in-person motion hearing on September 11, 2025. Defendant was present at the hearing with counsel. The Court determined that the fact the victim passed away is not a sufficient reason to reconsider the order of detention. In addition, it found that the fact Defendant's counsel needs his assistance to search for and locate documents is not grounds to grant Defendant a bond. However, after confirming with Defendant that the documents are located at his residence and he is the only person that can prepare them, the Court offered to furlough Defendant for six hours for his attorney, Paul Sims, to take him to his residence and locate the documents. Defendant agreed to this at the hearing. As such, the Court entered an order that grants the Defendant's motion (Doc. 84). However, the following day, the Court

received an email from Mr. Sims that stated Defendant no longer wants to go to his home to find the missing documents.

Defendant has pled guilty. In the plea agreement, Defendant acknowledged that restitution is required, but the parties had not come to an agreement on the terms. The Court gave Defendant an opportunity to retrieve documents to mitigate the amount of restitution he will be required to pay, and he declined. Accordingly, the Court VACATES its order granting Defendant Edward Stief's Motion to Reconsider Order of Detention, and it now DENIES the motion (Doc. 81).

IT IS SO ORDERED.

DATED: September 23, 2025

s/ J. Phil Gilbert
J. PHIL GILBERT
United States District Judge